AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Appended hereto as an attachment is a new drawing sheet that includes new Figs. 8, 9, and 10 to respond to the objection to the drawings. The new figures show additional structural detail and in enlarged form to more clearly illustrate embodiments of the present invention. None of the drawing changes introduces new matter.

With regard to the suggestion that heat energy flows be shown in the drawings, reference is made to original Fig.7, in which heat flows from and toward the furnace are illustrated by respective arrows 14 and 15.

REMARKS

The drawings were objected to and the attached new drawing sheet is believed to overcome those objections. Approval and entry of the attached new drawing sheet is respectfully solicited.

All the claims were rejected as indefinite. In that regard, the claims as hereinabove amended are believed to clarify the method and structure constituting the present invention, and they are also believed to overcome the alleged indefiniteness.

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 were rejected as anticipated by the Schnöller '561 reference. That reference relates to a tubular diffusion container formed from a semiconductor material. A central region is a heating zone during a diffusion process wherein spaced, highly doped zones are formed by brushing a phosphorous-containing lacquer on the spaced zones and subjecting the container to a high temperature diffusion process to allow the phosphorous-containing lacquer to incorporate phosphorous atoms at the doped zones. After the diffusion process, aluminum clamps at attached to the doped zones to provide current terminals.

The Schnöller reference relates to a different process to provide a different structure. It does not provide a furnace having a furnace wall that is heated electrically, nor does it disclose or suggest current input devices that develop within the furnace wall local increases on heat flow at positions along the wall where current input devices are in contact. The claimed method of amended claim

1 and the claimed structural arrangement of amended claim 8 are not taught by that reference.

Regarding what is required to sustain a conclusion of anticipation of a claimed invention, in order for a reference to anticipate an invention as claimed the reference must disclose each and every element recited in the claim. Indeed, the tests that must be met in order to warrant a conclusion of anticipation as expressed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit are quoted in MPEP §2131 as follows:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)...."*The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.*" *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831,15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (Emphasis added).

Thus, the structural and functional recitations in a claim must be identically disclosed in the reference in order for a conclusion of anticipation to be warranted. The disclosure contained in the Schnöller reference clearly fall shorts of meeting those judicially-mandated requirements that are necessary to warrant a conclusion of anticipation of the present invention as it is claimed in amended claims 1 and 8.

In addition to not identically disclosing the method steps recited in amended claim 1 and the structural features that are recited in amended claim 8, the Schnöller reference also does not include the scope of disclosure that is necessary to enable one of only ordinary skill in the art to practice the claimed invention, based upon the disclosure contained in the reference. In that regard, it has been held that:

> For prior art to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) because it is "known," the knowledge must be publicly accessible, *Woodland Trust v. Flowertree Nursery, Inc.*, 148 F.3d 1368, 1370, 47 USPQ2d 1363, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1998), and *it must be sufficient to enable one with ordinary skill in the art to practice the invention*, *In re Borst*, 345 F.2d 851, 855, 145 USPQ 554, 557 (CCPA 1965).
> *Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1301, 64 USPQ2d 1270, (Fed. Cir. 2002) (Emphasis added).

Thus, if a reference is urged to constitute an anticipation of a claimed invention, then one having only ordinary skill in the art should be able to make and to use the claimed structure based solely upon the disclosure contained in that reference. But because the Schnöller reference does not disclose each of the claimed method steps and the claimed structure, there is not sufficient disclosure in that reference to enable one to arrive at the claimed invention based upon the specification and drawings contained in the Schnöller reference. Consequently, the invention as it is claimed in independent claims 1 and 8 is not anticipated by the Schnöller reference, nor are claims 2-6 and claims 9-13 that depend from respective ones of the independent claims, either directly or indirectly.

Claims 7 and 14 were rejected as obvious over the combination of the Schnöller '561 and the Ueno et al. '614 references. However, the Ueno et al. reference is deficient in the same respects as is the primary Schnöller reference. Thus, even if those references were to be combined in some way, their combination would not render obvious the invention as it is claimed in either of claims 7 or 14, which depend from independent claims 1 and 8, respectively.

Based upon the foregoing drawing and claim amendments, and the remarks presented above, the present application is believed to be in allowable form.

Consequently, reconsideration and reexamination of this application is respectfully requested with a view toward the issuance of an early Notice of Allowance.

The examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if this Amendment raises any questions, so that any such question can be quickly resolved in order that the present application can proceed toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

June 24, 2011

Alfred J. Mangels
Reg. No. 22,605
4729 Cornell Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45241
Tel.: (513) 469-0470